

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are currently pending, wherein Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12, 14, and 16-19. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 2 of the final office action (“Action”), the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-6, 10, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear what is meant by a “first width direction” and how a slot (i.e., “an opening, gap, groove or slit”) protrudes. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear whether applicant is claiming a cassette device or a cassette device in combination with thin film transistor arrays and color filters.

In response, Applicant notes that the use of the term “slot” resulted from the translation of the priority document from Korean to English. Accordingly, Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16-19 to replace the term “slot” with the term “support member” which is clearly supported by the original drawings.

Finally claims 4-6 have been amended to more clearly define a cassette for supporting liquid crystal display panels. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In paragraph 4 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,236,548 to Stadler et al. (“Stadler”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 1-3, 14 and 17 are not

anticipated by Stadler because Stadler fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

Upon entry of the above-identified amendment, independent claim 1 will define a cassette device for supporting substrates that includes, *inter alia*, a frame; a plurality of support members protruding from opposing sides of the frame; and at least two supporting bars connected to at least two of the plurality of support members, wherein the supporting bars contact and support a first surface of a substrate along first parallel sides of the substrate at opposing parallel regions of the first surface.

Nowhere in Stadler is there any disclosure of at least two supporting bars being connected to at least two support members such that the supporting bars contact and support a first surface of a substrate along first parallel sides of the substrate as claimed in claim 1 of the present application. At best, Stadler discloses a disk shaped magazine for holding disk-type semiconductor wafer that includes a plurality of main and subsidiary guide struts connected to each other at various angles. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Stadler.

Independent claim 14 defines a cassette for supporting substrates that includes, upon entry of the above-identified amendment, a plurality of support members protruding from opposing sides of a frame, the support members being substantially parallel to each other, and at least two supporting bars connected to at least two of the plurality of support members.

Nowhere in Stadler is there any disclosure of a plurality of support members protruding from opposing sides of a frame wherein the support members are substantially parallel to each other as claimed in claim 14 of the present application. At best, Stadler discloses a disk shaped magazine for holding disk-type semiconductor wafer that includes a

plurality of main and subsidiary guide struts connected to each other at various angles.

Accordingly, independent claim 14 is not anticipated by Stadler.

Claims 2, 3 and 17 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 14. Therefore, claims 2, 3, and 17 are patentable over Stadler for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In paragraph 6 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 4-13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stadler in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,948 to Inoue (“Inoue”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three criteria must be met. First, there must motivation to combine the cited references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combination must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 4-13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 are not rendered unpatentable over the combination of Stadler and Inoue because the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as discussed below.

Independent claim 4 defines a cassette device for support liquid crystal display panels that includes, upon entry of the above-identified amendments, a frame; a plurality of support members protruding from opposing sides of the frame; and at least two supporting bars connected to at least two of the plurality of support members, wherein the supporting bars contact and support a first surface of a liquid crystal display panel along first parallel sides of the panel at opposing parallel regions of the first surface. Accordingly, independent claim 4 is patentable over Stadler for at least the reason that Stadler fails to disclose or suggest a cassette that includes at least two of the plurality of support members, wherein the supporting

bars contact and support a first surface of a liquid crystal display panel along first parallel sides of the panel at opposing parallel regions of the first surface as claimed. (See discussion above with respect to claim 1.)

Independent claim 18 defines a cassette device for supporting substrates. The cassette includes, upon entry of the above-identified amendment; a frame having substantially rectangular shape; a plurality of support members protruding from opposing sides of the frame, the support members being substantially parallel to each other; and at least two supporting bars connected to at least two of the plurality of support members. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over Stadler for at least the reason that Stadler fails to disclose or suggest cassette the includes a rectangular frame and a plurality of support member protruding from opposing sides of the frame, the support members being substantially parallel to each other as claimed. (See discussion above with respect to claim 14).

Claims 4-13, 15, 16, and 19 variously depend from independent claims 1, 4, 14 and 18. Therefore, claims 4-13, 15, 16, and 19 are patentable over Stadler for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 14, and 18. Inoue discloses a method of fabricating and relocating a display panel. However, Inoue fails to overcome the deficiencies of Stadler.

Since Stadler and Inoue both fail to disclose or suggest a cassette that includes at least two supporting bars connected to at least two of the plurality of support members wherein the supporting bars contact and support a first surface of a liquid crystal display panel along first parallel sides of the panel at opposing parallel regions of the first surface as claimed in claims 1-13 or wherein the support members are substantially parallel to each other as claimed in claims 14-19, the combination of these two patents cannot possibly disclose or suggest said elements. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Stadler and

Inoue, which Applicant does not concede, the combination would still fail to render claims 4-13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 unpatentable because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner find the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

The undersigned hereby signs this filing under the authority provided by 37 C.F.R. §1.34 pending the filing of a Power of Attorney and Statement under 3.73(b) executed by Assignee.

Dated: August 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Penny L. Caudle
Penny L. Caudle
Registration No.: 46,607
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant